

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of the subject application in which claims 1-10 and 12-29 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 1-10, 12, 13, and 20-29 have been allowed. Claims 16-19 are objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected. No amendments to the claims are being made by this amendment.

Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the following comments.

**I. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 14 and 15 are respectfully requested.**

Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,497,030 to Bowling, et al. ("Bowling"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action dated March 28, 2006 (hereinafter "Office Action"), asserts that Bowling teaches single port measurements (Office Action, Response to Arguments section at page 5; citing Bowling, FIG. 2, reference number 41, col. 3, ll. 47-54). Representative for Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion as well as the contention that claim 14 is anticipated by Bowling.

Bowling teaches a network analyzer that measures S-parameters of an N-port combining structure (Bowling, Abstract). In Bowling, relative amplitude and phase are measured at an input port 41 while ports 2 through N-1 of an N-way summing network 40 are shorted to ground (Bowling, col. 3, ll. 47-61). The network analyzer 10 measures the relative amplitude and phase of the signal incident at the port 41 and the signal transmitted through either the sumport 47 or the port 49. The sumport 47 or the port 49 provide a transmission return path via properly positioning switches 33 and 34 of a coaxial switch network 30 (Bowling, col. 3, ll. 47-61, col. 4 ll. 41-48). The switch 33 can be positioned to provide a closed circuit from either switch 33 or 34 to the transmission return port 12 of the network analyzer 10 which provides an input to the analyzer 10 (Bowling, col. 2, ll. 62-66). In contrast to the assertion in the Office Action, Bowling does not disclose that any of the waveform parameters are determined through a measurement at one port of the network while each of the other ports of the network are not measured and are one of open or shorted,

as recited in claim 14. Instead, all measurements are disclosed in Bowling as including relative measurements of the signal incident upon port 41 and the signal transmitted through either port 47 or port 49, which signal is measured at the return port 12. Therefore, the measurements of the power combining structure taught by Bowling are not single port measurements, as the Office Action contends. For the reasons stated above, Bowling does not anticipate claim 14. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and is allowable for at least the aforementioned deficiencies of Bowling. Additionally, claim 15 introduces additional means for performing single port measurements, which measurements are utilized by the means for determining of claim 14. As discussed above, Bowling fails to teach structure that performs single port measurements, as recited in claim 15, based on which at least one of waveform parameters and reflection coefficients can be determined. This is because the approach taught by Bowling employs relative measurements at more than port to determine corresponding S-parameters (See, *e.g.*, Bowling at col. 4, ll. 41-48). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 15.

## **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 1-10, 12, 13 and 20-29 have been allowed.

Claims 16-19 have been objected to on the basis that they depend from a rejected claim, but would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. For the reasons stated above, claim 14 should be allowed over the prior art. Accordingly, claims 16-19 should also be allowed since they depend from allowable claim 14. Withdrawal of the objection of claims 16-19 is respectfully requested.

**III. CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this paper, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at (216) 621-2234, Ext. 106.

No additional fees should be due for this response. In the event any fees are due in connection with the filing of this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Gary J. Pitzer  
Registration No. 39,334  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

**CUSTOMER NO.: 022879**

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Legal Department MS 79  
3404 E. Harmony Road  
Ft. Collins, CO 80528